

REMARKS

By this amendment, claims 1-26 are pending, in which claims 7 and 17 are currently amended. No new matter is introduced.

The Office Action mailed March 30, 2004 rejected claims 1-26 under the judicially-created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting over *Sexton et al.* '095 (US 6,499,095) and *Sexton et al.* '685 (US 6,434,685). This rejection is respectfully traversed because the claims of the present application recite patentably distinct features not required by the claims of *Sexton et al.* '095 and *Sexton et al.* '685.

For example, claims 1-4, 7-14, 17-22, and 24-25 all recite either explicitly or by virtue of their dependency pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 4, specific uses of a “tagged machine pointer.” Nevertheless, nothing in claims 1-30 of *Sexton et al.* '095 and claims 1-28 of *Sexton et al.* '985 require the use of such a feature. In the statement of the rejection, the Office Action contended that the claims of *Sexton et al.* '095 and *Sexton et al.* '685 read upon a “first machine pointer” and a “second machine pointer” in claim 1 of the present application. Without addressing the merits of the Office Action’s correspondence, it is noted that claims 1 and 11 of the present application are actually more specific: they recite a “first **tagged** machine pointer” and a “second **tagged** machine pointer.”

As for claims 5-6, 15-16, 23, and 26, independent claims 5 and 15 recite: “storing a reference within a first object to a second object in the memory as a numeric reference that encodes a location of the second object as **an offset from an address of the first object in the memory.**” This feature is not required in the claims of *Sexton et al.* '095 and *Sexton et al.* '685. For example, claim 1 of *Sexton et al.* '095 recites “an integer offset from a virtual memory address” but does not necessarily require the patentably distinct species of the particular address recited in claim 5 of the present application. Moreover, claim 8 of *Sexton et al.* '695 recites “an

offset within a page of memory to the beginning of the referenced object"; neither this recitation nor "a page address indicative of a beginning of a referencing page" (as cited in the Office Action) require that the offset be "from an address of the first object in the memory" as recited in claims 5 and 15 of the present application.

Therefore, the present application, as amended, overcomes the objections and rejections of record and is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration is respectfully requested. If any unresolved issues remain, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone the undersigned attorney at 703-425-8516 so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible.

Respectfully Submitted,

DITTHAVONG & CARLSON, P.C.

10/30/2004
Date


Stephen C. Carlson
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 39929

10507 Braddock Rd
Suite A
Fairfax, VA 22032
Tel. 703-425-8516
Fax. 703-425-8518